

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at page 14.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicant is entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,668,597 to Parulski et al. (hereafter merely "Parulski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,700,610 to Kijima et al. (hereinafter, merely "Kijima") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,841,369 to Nishizawa, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Nishizawa").

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“An image photographing apparatus...

wherein only image signals of the single detection area are read out and used for controlling the scanning image device and processing of the image signals so that the control period is shortened than that of using entire image signals.” (emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Parulski, Kijimam and Nishizawa, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the above-recited features of independent claim 1. Specifically, Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion an image photographing apparatus “wherein only image signals of the single detection area are read out and used for controlling the scanning image device and processing of the image signals so that the control period is shortened than that of using entire image signals”, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 6, 11 and 16 are also patentable.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent

claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800